

CHAPTER III: EMPLOYMENT, EARNINGS, AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME AMONG RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This chapter presents findings on employment, work hours, earnings patterns, total household income, and poverty among respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys.¹

A. EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEYS

Employment Rates by Case Characteristics

Respondents to the survey were asked whether they were working for pay at the time of the interviews, including working for an employer or self-employment. As indicated in Exhibit III-1, 72 percent of Cohort One and 72.5 percent of Cohort Two were working for pay at the time of the surveys. Persons from one-parent families were much more likely to be working than persons from two-parent families. However, as noted later in the chapter, respondents from two-parent families were more likely to have a spouse or partner who was employed.

In both samples, black respondents were much more likely to be employed than white respondents. This was also true within the two major sampling strata. More educated respondents were more likely to be working than less educated respondents. The difference in employment status based on educational level was particularly evident among one-parent families. Among one-parent cases in Cohort One, 89 percent of college attendees were working, compared to only 58 percent of high school drop-outs. Among one-parent cases in Cohort Two, only 61 percent of drop-outs were working, compared to 92 percent of college attendees. Among Cohort Two, education had no impact upon employment rates in two-parent cases.

¹ In several of the tables in this chapter, the n's for the total column are different from the combined n's for one-parent and two-parent cases. The reason for this is explained in Chapter I, Section F of the report.

**EXHIBIT III-1
RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS AT FOLLOW-UP –
PERCENT WORKING FOR PAY**

	Cohort One (n=337)	Cohort Two (n=303)
Overall sample	72.0%	72.5%
Case Type		
One-parent	77.6%*	77.8%*
Two-parent	60.6%*	61.6%*
Ethnicity		
Black	79.7%*	77.8%*
White	59.3%*	63.4%*
Education		
Did not complete high school	57.0%**	61.9%**
Completed high school only	74.1%	74.5%
Attended college	83.7%	80.3%**

*The differences between the 1-parent and 2-parent cases and between blacks and whites were statistically significant at the .05 level in both cohorts

** The differences between drop-outs and others was statistically significant at the .05 level for Cohort 1. The difference between drop-outs and college attendees was statistically significant at the .05 level in Cohort Two

Length of Time in Current Job

Exhibit III-2 shows that 35 percent of employed respondents in Cohort One had been in their current job for one year or more, and 63 percent had been in their job for six months or more. Among Cohort Two, 66 percent of the employed respondents had been in their current job for one year or more.

**EXHIBIT III-2
RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS -- LENGTH OF TIME
IN CURRENT JOB**

Time in Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
One month or less	10.7%	7.0%
More than 1 month but less than 6 months	26.8%	13.2%
More than 6 months but less than 12 months	27.4%	13.8%
12 months or more	35.1%	66.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%
Median months	12.0	12.0

B. TYPES OF JOBS HELD BY RESPONDENTS

Information on the types of jobs obtained by Food Stamp leavers is potentially useful to state and local policymakers in designing job placement and job development programs for Food Stamp recipients. Research has shown that certain types of occupations are preferable to others on a number of key indicators, including wages, health benefits, employment stability, opportunities for advancement, job satisfaction, and the need to work non-traditional hours. Ideally, steps should be taken by state and local program managers to help direct Food Stamp recipients into jobs that have the greatest prospects for long-term employment stability.

Types of Occupations

Exhibit III-3 shows that, overall, the most common occupations among employed respondents were assembly/production/packer (23.6 percent of employed respondents in Cohort One and 28.7 percent of employed respondents in Cohort Two).

**EXHIBIT III-3
TYPES OF JOBS HELD BY CURRENTLY EMPLOYED
RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS**

Type of Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Assembly/production/packing	23.6%	28.7%
Cashier/sales clerk	12.4%	8.0%
Office/clerical	12.1%	14.6%
Nurse's aide	9.8%	8.7%
Housekeeper/janitor	9.1%	6.7%
Restaurant worker/kitchen helper	8.2%	13.5%
Teacher's aide	4.0%	0.7%
“Other professional”	8.0%	4.8%
Trades/construction	5.0%	2.1%
Bus driver	2.5%	4.1%
Child care	1.8%	1.5%
“Other services”	1.5%	6.6%

Types of Employers

Exhibit III-4 indicates that, overall, almost 22 percent of the employed respondents from Cohort One and 29 percent of the employed respondents from Cohort Two were working for factories or for other manufacturing employers.

**EXHIBIT III-4
TYPES OF EMPLOYERS FOR WHOM RESPONDENTS WERE
WORKING, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Type of Employer	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Factory/manufacturing	21.7%	28.7%
Retail/grocery	17.2%	8.6%
Hospital/health care facility	13.2%	15.7%
Professional services firm	11.4%	12.0%
Restaurant	10.2%	14.9%
School/college	7.5%	6.6%
“Other services”	7.3%	6.5%
Government agency	4.4%	4.0%
Construction	2.1%	0.7%
Farm	1.3%	0.0%
Self-employed	1.1%	2.2%

C. WORK HOURS AND NON-TRADITIONAL SCHEDULES

Hours Worked Per Week

Most of the employed respondents were working full-time or almost full-time. Exhibit III-5 shows that about 65 percent of the employed respondents in both cohorts were working 40+ hours per week. In a separate analysis, we found that that 88 percent of the employed persons in Cohort One and 86 percent of the employed persons in Cohort Two were working 30 or more hours per week. In both cohorts, respondents worked an average of 37 hours per week. In a separate analysis, it was found that only 4 percent of Cohort One and 5 percent of Cohort Two were working less than 20 hours per week.

In Cohort One, hours worked per week by employed respondents did not vary greatly by ethnicity. In Cohort Two, however, employed blacks were much more likely than employed whites to be working 40 or more hours per week.

In Cohort One, hours worked per week did not vary greatly by education of the respondent. Respondents who had not attended college were slightly more likely to be working full-time. In Cohort Two, however, the more educated respondents were working more hours.

**EXHIBIT III-5
HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS
STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS AT FOLLOW-UP**

	Cohort One (n=243)		Cohort Two (n=219)	
	Average Hours per Week	Percent Working 40+ Hours	Average Hours per Week	Percent Working 40+ Hours
Overall sample	37.0	64.5%	36.6	65.4%
<i>Case Type</i>				
One-parent	38.0	66.8%	36.8	69.3%*
Two-parent	35.5	58.2%	36.1	55.2%*
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
Black	37.9	64.4%	37.9	71.3%
White	38.3	65.2%	33.9	54.0%
<i>Education</i>				
Did not complete high school	38.2	68.1%	33.6*	51.5%
Completed high school only	36.6	64.4%	37.7*	70.5%
Attended college	36.8	62.2%	36.6	65.7%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level. The difference between high school drop-outs and those who had completed high school only was statistically significant at the .05 level

Non-Traditional Daily Work Schedules

Having to work evenings, nights, or weekends can create problems for families in such areas as child care and transportation. Exhibit III-6 indicates that almost 35 percent of the employed leavers in Cohort One and 30 percent of employed leavers in Cohort Two were working evening hours or night shifts. For the most part, those who worked non-traditional schedules were working in the evenings.

**EXHIBIT III-6
PERCENT OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WHO WORKED NON-
TRADITIONAL DAILY WORK SCHEDULES, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Work Hours	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Usually begin work between 4 p.m. and 5 a.m.	11.3%	8.8%
Usually end work after 6 p.m. and before 8 a.m.	31.3%	25.2%
Usually begin work 4 p.m. to 5 a.m. or end work 6 p.m. to 8 a.m.	34.6%	29.8%

Working on Weekends

Exhibit III-7 indicates that 44 percent of all employed respondents from Cohort One and 51 percent of employed respondents from Cohort Two worked all or most weekends.

**EXHIBIT III-7
PERCENT OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WHO WORKED
WEEKENDS (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Weekend Hours	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	243	219
Work every weekend	14.1%	21.5%
Work most weekends	30.4%	29.7%
Occasionally work weekends	22.2%	6.5%
Rarely/never work weekends	33.2%	42.3%
TOTAL.	100.0%	100.0%

D. EARNINGS PATTERNS

Earnings by Household Type

For employed respondents, Exhibit III-8 shows monthly earnings by type of household. The data indicate that employed respondents from one-parent families had higher median earnings per month than employed respondents from two-parent families. However, the differences were not statistically significant. Overall, one-third of the employed respondents from Cohort One were earning \$1,500 per month or more, and 73.4 percent were earning more than \$1,000 per month. Of the employed respondents from Cohort Two, 28 percent were earning \$1,500 or more, and 71 percent were earning more than \$1,000 per month.

Statewide data for 2000 show that the average monthly earnings of employed workers in South Carolina were about \$2,345, based on the UI wage reporting system. Most of the survey respondents, therefore, were earning much less than the statewide average. This is because most were working in low-skilled occupations. Despite this fact, most employed leavers were financially better off than when they were on Food Stamps, especially since none of them had been receiving TANF benefits.

**EXHIBIT III-8
MONTHLY EARNINGS AMONG EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Monthly Earnings	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	124	96	220*
\$1 - \$500	2.2%	8.5%	3.8%
\$501 - \$750	6.6%	13.6%	8.4%
\$751 - \$1,000	15.6%	11.2%	14.4%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	17.5%	19.7%	18.0%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	24.4%	15.7%	22.2%
\$1,500 +	33.8%	31.4%	33.2%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$1,301	\$1,191	\$1,299
	Cohort Two		
Monthly Earnings	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	100	96	197*
\$1 - \$500	6.8%	9.2%	7.4%
\$501 - \$750	4.0%	9.0%	5.4%
\$751 - \$1,000	16.6%	13.8%	15.8%
\$1,001 - \$1,250	16.4%	23.9%	18.6%
\$1,251 - \$1,500	25.9%	21.8%	24.7%
\$1,500 +	30.3%	22.4%	28.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$1,299	\$1,201	\$1,264

* Persons who did not report their earnings were excluded from the analysis
The differences between one-parent and two-parent cases were **not** statistically significant at the .05 level

Impact of Education and Ethnicity on Earnings

With regard to education, median monthly earnings in Cohort One were somewhat higher among respondents with more education. Among employed respondents in Cohort Two, education had an even greater impact upon earnings – persons who had attended college were earning 30 percent more on average than persons who had dropped out of high school. With regard to ethnicity, median monthly earnings among Cohort One were higher among whites (\$1,386) than blacks (\$1,273). In Cohort Two, however, blacks were earning more than whites.

Hourly Wage Rates

Exhibit III-9 shows that almost 59 percent of all employed respondents in Cohort One were earning \$7.00 per hour or more, and that the median hourly wage was \$7.50. Only one-in-six of the respondents from one-parent families were earning less than \$6 per hour,

compared to one-quarter of the respondents from two-parent families. In Cohort Two, 71 percent were earning \$7 per hour or more, and the median hourly wage was almost \$8 per hour.

**EXHIBIT III-9
HOURLY WAGE RATES OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS IN
PRIMARY JOB, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Hourly Wages	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	124	96	220*
Less than \$6.00	16.6%	25.4%	20.5%
\$6.00 - \$6.99	20.0%	20.7%	20.3%
\$7.00 - \$7.99	23.4%	13.9%	19.2%
\$8.00 - \$8.99	15.7%	12.0%	14.1%
\$9.00 - \$9.99	11.2%	12.0%	11.5%
\$10.00+	13.2%	15.9%	14.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$7.63	\$7.49	\$7.50
	Cohort Two		
Hourly Wages	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	100	96	197*
Less than \$6.00	13.3%	16.8%	14.3%
\$6.00 - \$6.99	13.0%	17.4%	14.2%
\$7.00 - \$7.99	20.8%	22.7%	21.3%
\$8.00 - \$8.99	25.4%	23.1%	24.7%
\$9.00 - \$9.99	6.2%	7.1%	6.5%
\$10.00+	21.3%	12.8%	18.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$8.00	\$7.47	\$7.96

* Persons who did not report their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Earnings by Occupation

Exhibit III-10 indicates that median monthly earnings varied greatly by occupation. The occupations with the highest monthly earnings included “nurse, teacher, and other professionals,” assembly/production, office/clerical, and trades/construction. The occupations with the lowest monthly earnings were child care, restaurant worker, cashier/sales clerk, and housekeeper/janitor.

**EXHIBIT III-10
MEDIAN MONTHLY EARNINGS OF EMPLOYED
RESPONDENTS, BY PRIMARY OCCUPATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Type of Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
Assembly/production/packing	\$1,390	\$1,420
Cashier/sales	\$955	\$1,092
Office/clerical	\$1,387	\$1,534
Nurse's aide	\$1,115	\$1,343
Housekeeping/janitor	\$958	\$770
Restaurant worker	\$1,069	\$953
Teacher's aide	\$892	\$1,269
Nurse, teacher, other professional	\$1,412	\$1,830
Trade/construction	\$1,212	\$1,386
Bus driver	\$1,001	\$1,169
Child care	\$628	\$1,010
Other services	\$1,136	\$957

Hourly Wages by Occupation

Exhibit III-11 shows that hourly earnings varied substantially by occupation, with the highest being trades/construction, “nurse, teacher, and other professional,” “other services,” assembly/production, and office/clerical. The occupations with the lowest hourly average wage were babysitter, teacher’s aide, housekeeper, cashier/sales clerk, and restaurant worker/kitchen helper.

**EXHIBIT III-11
MEDIAN HOURLY WAGE OF EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS,
BY PRIMARY OCCUPATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Type of Job	Cohort One	Cohort Two
Assembly/production/packing	\$8.05	\$8.00
Cashier/sales	\$6.50	\$7.10
Office/clerical	\$8.00	\$8.79
Nurse's aide	\$7.35	\$8.00
Housekeeping/janitor	\$6.15	\$7.00
Restaurant worker	\$6.50	\$6.71
Teacher's aide	\$5.93	\$7.62
Nurse, teacher, other professional	\$8.78	\$11.25
Trade/construction	\$9.30	\$8.00
Bus driver	\$7.25	\$9.34
Child care	\$5.39	\$5.83
Other services	\$8.53	\$6.41

E. RESPONDENTS NOT CURRENTLY WORKING

This section presents findings on respondents who were still off Food Stamps when interviewed but who were not working for pay.

Reasons for Not Working

Exhibits III-11 and III-12 show the reasons given by unemployed respondents for not working. The most common reason – cited by about one-third of all unemployed persons in Cohort One and 31 percent of unemployed persons in Cohort Two – was physical or mental illness. In Cohort one, this was mentioned by 37.1 percent of the respondents from one-parent families.

Among Cohort One, the next most common reason was “want to stay home with children.” However, only 9 percent of the respondents from one-parent families mentioned this as a reason, compared to 24 percent of respondents from two-parent families. The data suggest that persons from two-parent families were more likely to be staying out of the labor force voluntarily because they had a spouse or partner who had income. Similar patterns were found for Cohort Two.

In Cohort One, respondents from two-parent families were much more likely than respondents from one-parent families to cite the physical or mental illness of a family member as a reason for not working. In Cohort Two, there was little difference between the two types of cases. Almost 11 percent of the respondents in the two cohorts mentioned child care problems as a reason for not working.

**EXHIBIT III-11
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS
– REASONS NOT WORKING NOW,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE, COHORT ONE**

Reason Not Working	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	37	68	105
Physical/mental illness/injury (self)	37.1%	31.8%	33.6%
Want to stay home with children	8.8%	24.3%	18.8%
Laid off/fired/quit job	17.1%	16.1%	16.5%
Can't find job/good paying job	10.7%	11.8%	11.4%
Lack child care	10.7%	10.7%	10.7%
Physical/mental illness/injury (other person)	3.4%	9.6%	7.4%
In full/part time education	5.4%	8.0%	7.1%
Currently or recently pregnant	5.4%	4.0%	4.5%
Have no transportation	7.3%	2.2%	4.0%
Other	6.8%	1.1%	3.1%

**EXHIBIT III-12
UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS
– REASONS NOT WORKING NOW,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE, COHORT TWO**

Reason Not Working	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	32	65	84
Physical/mental illness/injury(self)	31.1%	31.1%	31.1%
Laid off from job	24.9%	12.3%	19.1%
Want to stay home with children	6.2%	26.9%	15.6%
Can't find job	14.7%	9.2%	12.2%
Physical/mental illness/injury (family member)	12.4%	10.4%	11.5%
Have no transportation	13.0%	8.4%	10.9%
Lack child care	6.2%	16.5%	10.9%
Don't have skills/experience	12.4%	5.3%	9.2%
In full/part time education	7.9%	8.4%	8.1%
Currently or recently pregnant	6.2%	8.4%	7.2%
Fired from job	9.1%	4.2%	6.9%
Can't find job that pays enough	8.5%	4.2%	6.5%
Quit job	6.2%	5.3%	5.8%
Lose benefits if working	2.3%	7.0%	4.4%
In job training	4.5%	3.1%	3.9%
Can't get to a job on time	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%
Too old to work	3.9%	0.0%	2.1%

Work History

For Cohort One, Exhibit III-13 indicates that 31 percent of the persons who were not working at the time of the survey had worked at some time in the previous 12 months, while 69 percent had not. In Cohort Two, almost 53 percent of the currently unemployed respondents had worked in the past year, including almost 59 percent of the one-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT III-13
PERCENTAGE OF UNEMPLOYED RESPONDENTS WHO HAD
WORKED FOR PAY IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Household Type	Cohort One	Cohort Two
1-parent (N = 37)	32.7%	58.8%
2-parent (N = 68)	29.7%	45.1%
TOTAL (N = 105)	30.8%	52.6%

Work Hours and Non-Traditional Work Schedules in the Most Recent Job

Of the unemployed respondents who had worked in the past 12 months, 66 percent of the persons in Cohort One and 81 percent of the persons in Cohort Two had worked 40 or more hours per week in their last jobs. Almost 40 percent of persons in Cohort One and 50 percent of the persons in Cohort Two had worked early morning or evening hours.

Earnings in Previous Job

Of the unemployed respondents who had worked in the past 12 months, 50 percent of the persons in Cohort One and 86 percent of the persons in Cohort Two had been earning \$1,000 or more per month in their previous jobs. Among Cohort One, median monthly earnings did not vary greatly between one-parent and two-parent cases. Among Cohort Two, median earnings were much higher among one-parent cases.

F. PRESENCE OF OTHER EMPLOYED ADULTS – CASES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

Presence of Other Adults in the Household

Exhibit III-14 shows that almost 53 percent of Cohort One respondents and 47 percent of Cohort Two respondents were living with at least one other adult at the time of follow-up. Among the families that were two-parent cases when they left Food Stamps, only 82 percent of Cohort One and 71 percent of Cohort Two were still living with another adult at the time of the surveys one year later.

As shown in Exhibit III-15, almost 37 percent of Cohort One and 30 percent of Cohort Two were living with a spouse or partner at the time of the surveys. Among two-parent cases, only 77 percent of the Cohort One and 68 percent of Cohort Two were still living with a spouse or partner at the time of the surveys.

**EXHIBIT III-14
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH OTHER ADULTS AT THE
TIME OF THE SURVEYS, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(PERSONS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)***

	Cohort One		
Number of Other Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
None	61.1% **	17.5% **	47.4%
One or more	38.9%	82.5%	52.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Number of Other Adults	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
None	65.1% **	29.2% **	53.4%
One or more	34.9%	70.8%	46.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The one-parent v. two-parent status of respondents refers to their status when they left Food Stamps. Data on the presence of other adults are from the surveys conducted one year later

**The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

**EXHIBIT III-15
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH A SPOUSE OR PARTNER,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Sample	1-parent	2-parent	Total
Cohort One	18.4%	76.9%	36.8%
Cohort Two	11.5%	68.1%	30.0%

Employment of Spouse/Partner

Exhibit III-16 shows that 26 percent of Cohort One and 24 percent of Cohort Two were living with an employed spouse or partner at the time of the surveys. Among the two-parent cases, about 53 percent of Cohort One and 51 percent of Cohort Two were living with an employed spouse or partner at the time of the surveys.

**EXHIBIT III-16
PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS LIVING WITH AN EMPLOYED SPOUSE
OR PARTNER, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
Not living with spouse or partner	81.6%*	23.1%*	63.2%
Spouse/partner present and employed	14.0%	53.1%	26.3%
Spouse/partner present and not employed	4.4%	23.8%	10.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Not living with spouse or partner	88.5%*	31.9%*	70.0%
Spouse/partner present and employed	11.5%	50.8%	24.4%
Spouse/partner present and not employed	0.0%	17.3%	5.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Percent of Respondents Employed or Living with an Employed Spouse/Partner

Exhibit III-17 combines the data on the respondent’s employment situation and the employment of the spouse/partner to highlight the respondent’s overall situation. In Cohort One, 82 percent of the respondents from one-parent families were either employed or living with an employed spouse or partner. About 85 percent of the respondents from two-parent families were either employed or living with an employed spouse or partner. The comparable figures for Cohort Two were 82 percent and 86 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-17
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSE/PARTNER,
BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Status	Cohort One		
	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
Respondent currently employed	77.6%	60.6%	72.0%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed spouse/partner	4.4%	24.5%	10.8%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed spouse/partner	18.0%	14.8%	17.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Respondent currently employed	77.8%	61.6%	72.5%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed spouse/partner	3.8%	24.3%	10.5%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed spouse/partner	18.4%	14.1%	17.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Percent of Respondents Employed or Living with an Employed Adult

Exhibit III-18 combines the data on the respondent’s employment situation and the employment of any other adult in the household, including a spouse/partner or any unrelated adult. In Cohort One, 84 percent of the respondents from one-parent families were either employed or living with an employed adult, as were 85 percent of the respondents from two-parent families. The corresponding percentages for Cohort Two were 83 percent and 86 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-18
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF RESPONDENTS AND OTHER ADULTS, BY
HOUSEHOLD TYPE (RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	166	173	337
Respondent currently employed	77.6%	60.6%	72.0%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed adult	6.0%	24.5%	11.8%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed adult	16.4%	14.8%	15.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Status	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	145	169	303
Respondent currently employed	77.8%	61.6%	72.5%
Respondent currently not employed, but living with employed adult	5.7%	24.7%	11.9%
Respondent currently not employed and not living with employed adult	16.6%	13.7%	15.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Work History of Unemployed Spouses/Partners

In separate analyses, it was found that about 71 percent of the Cohort One respondents who were living with an unemployed spouse or partner indicated that their spouse or partner had worked in the last 12 months. However, the figure for Cohort Two was only 37 percent. About 24 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported that their spouse or partner was not working indicated that physical or mental illness of the spouse/partner was the reason for being unemployed. For Cohort Two, the figure was 42 percent.

Work Hours of Employed Spouses/Partners

As shown in Exhibit III-19, almost 85 percent of the Cohort One respondents who had an employed spouse or partner reported that their spouse or partner was working 40 hours or more per week. For Cohort Two, the figure was 87 percent.

**EXHIBIT III-19
RESPONDENTS WITH EMPLOYED SPOUSES OR PARTNERS --
TOTAL HOURS WORKED PER WEEK BY SPOUSE/PARTNER
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Hours Per Week	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	88	74
40+	84.7%	87.4%
30-39	7.9%	8.3%
20-29	4.4%	4.3%
1-19	3.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Earnings of Employed Spouses or Partners

As shown in Exhibit III-20, about 43 percent of the Cohort One respondents who had an employed spouse or partner reported that the spouse or partner earned \$1,500 or more per month. In separate analyses adjusting for persons who did not report earnings of the spouse or partner, the percentage was 64 percent. The adjusted figure for Cohort Two was 63 percent.

**EXHIBIT III-20
RESPONDENTS WITH EMPLOYED SPOUSES OR PARTNERS --
TOTAL MONTHLY EARNINGS OF SPOUSE/PARTNER
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

Monthly Earnings	Cohort One	Cohort Two
N	88	74
\$1-\$500	1.4%	0.6%
\$501-\$1,000	4.9%	2.8%
\$1,001-1250	5.2%	9.0%
\$1,251-\$1,500	11.8%	11.1%
\$1,500+	43.1%	40.9%
Not reported	32.6%	35.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
MEDIAN	\$1,652	\$1,604

G. TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Respondents were asked “About how much money do you have coming into the household each month, including everyone’s earnings, as well as child support, unemployment benefits, and SSI, but not including cash assistance or Food Stamps?”

Total Household Income by Household Type

As shown in Exhibit III-21, 1.6 percent of the Cohort One respondents reported no income coming into the household and another 9.1 percent refused to answer the question or said that they did not know. In Cohort Two, 5.2 percent reported no income, and another 7.4 percent said they did not know or refused to answer. About 6.4 percent of Cohort One and 11 percent of Cohort Two reported monthly household income of less than \$500 per month. Almost 70 percent of Cohort One and 56 percent of Cohort Two reported household income of more than \$1,000 per month. In both cohorts, two-parent cases had higher monthly incomes on average than one-parent cases.

**EXHIBIT III-21
TOTAL MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Monthly Income	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	164	173	334
None	1.2%	2.3%	1.6%
\$1-\$499	5.2%	3.9%	4.8%
\$500-\$999	15.1%	14.2%	14.8%
\$1,000-\$1,499	29.7%	22.1%	27.3%
\$1,500+	37.8%*	52.4%*	42.4%
Don't know/refused	11.0%	5.1%	9.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,411	\$1,550	\$1,457
	Cohort Two		
Monthly Income	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	146	167	304
None	6.0%	3.6%	5.2%
\$1-\$499	5.9%	5.6%	5.8%
\$500-\$999	27.0%	22.7%	25.6%
\$1,000-\$1,499	32.1%	31.2%	31.8%
\$1,500+	21.1%	28.5%	24.2%
Don't know/refused	6.9%	8.4%	7.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,131	\$1,250	\$1,169

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was statistically significant at the .05 level

Total Household Income by Education and Ethnicity

Exhibit III-22 indicates that household income varied by education. Of the Cohort One respondents who had not completed high school, 25 percent reported household income of less than \$1,000 per month, compared to 21 percent of those who had completed high school only, and 17 percent of those who had attended college. The corresponding figures for Cohort Two were 51 percent, 33 percent, and 30 percent. In a separate analysis, it was found that average monthly household income was somewhat higher for whites than blacks: \$1,567 v. \$1,370 in Cohort One and \$1,214 v. \$1,146 in Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT III-22
TOTAL MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME, BY EDUCATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Monthly Income	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School or GED Only	Attended College
N	79	180	74
None	1.0%	2.0%	1.2%
\$1-\$499	9.5%	3.3%	3.3%
\$500-\$999	14.9%	15.8%	12.2%
\$1,000-\$1,499	27.9%	23.9%	35.1%
\$1,500+	37.7%	44.3%	42.8%
Don't know/refused	9.0%	10.7%	5.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,395	\$1,469	\$1,493
	Cohort Two		
Monthly Income	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School or GED Only	Attended College
N	76	149	59
None	9.4%	3.9%	3.7%
\$1-\$499	8.2%	4.6%	6.2%
\$500-\$999	33.1%	24.2%	19.9%
\$1,000-\$1,499	19.3%	36.6%	34.1%
\$1,500+	21.5%	25.2%	24.6%
Don't know/refused	8.5%	5.5%	11.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Average income	\$1,024	\$1,211	\$1,233

Primary Sources of Household Income, by Household Type

Respondents were asked to identify the primary sources of income for their households. Respondents could identify more than one source. Exhibit III-23 indicates that 86 percent of the Cohort One respondents who reported any household income cited their job as a primary

source of income. The percentage did not vary greatly by type of household. The figure for Cohort Two was 88 percent.

In Cohort One, 28 percent of the respondents from one-parent families identified child support as a primary source of income. The figure for Cohort Two was 29 percent. About 14 percent of Cohort One and almost 19 percent of Cohort Two identified SSI or Social Security as a primary source of income.

EXHIBIT III-23
PRIMARY SOURCES OF FAMILY INCOME, BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)

	Cohort One		
Primary Source	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	142	157	293
Earnings from a job	84.6%	88.8%	86.0%
Child support	28.4%	12.1%	23.1%
SSI or Social Security	14.2%	14.0%	14.1%
Unemployment benefits	0.5%	2.5%	1.2%
Help with utilities	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
Help from friends or family	3.6%	2.5%	3.2%
Workers compensation	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
Other	0.9%	0.0%	0.6%
	Cohort Two		
Primary Source	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	126	148	264
Earnings from a job	86.7%	90.3%	87.9%
Child support	29.0%	15.2%	24.5%
SSI or Social Security	17.7%	20.8%	18.7%
Unemployment benefits	3.2%	1.4%	2.6%
Help with utilities	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Help from friends or family	0.6%	2.2%	1.1%
Workers compensation	0.0%	1.4%	0.4%
Other	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%

Primary Sources of Household Income, by Education

Exhibit III-24 indicates that respondents with more education were more likely to identify earnings from a job as a primary source of income. Respondents who had attended college were less likely to identify SSI or Social Security as a source of income than less educated respondents. In Cohort Two, the more educated were more likely to identify child support as a source of income.

**EXHIBIT III-24
PRIMARY SOURCES OF FAMILY INCOME, BY EDUCATION
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)**

	Cohort One		
Primary Source	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	69	155	70
Earnings from a job	77.9%	86.6%	92.8%
Child support	22.6%	24.1%	21.3%
SSI or Social Security	14.5%	16.6%	8.3%
Unemployment benefits	1.1%	1.7%	0.0%
Other	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Help with utilities	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Help from friends or family	5.1%	3.6%	0.6%
Workers compensation	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
	Cohort Two		
Primary Source	Did Not Complete High School or GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	62	152	50
Earnings from a job	79.6%	88.0%	97.7%
Child support	18.3%	23.4%	35.4%
SSI or Social Security	24.6%	18.2%	13.2%
Unemployment benefits	0.7%	4.2%	0.0%
Other	4.5%	0.5%	0.0%
Help with utilities	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Help from friends or family	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%
Workers compensation	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%

Primary Sources of Household Income, by Ethnicity

In Cohort One, there was not a great difference between blacks and whites in terms of primary sources of household income. In Cohort Two, whites (23 percent) were more likely than blacks (16 percent) to identify SSI or Social Security as a source of income.

H. POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS

This section examines the poverty status of families who were still off Food Stamps, based on reported earnings and household income. Two separate analyses are presented:

- an analysis based on the reported earnings of the respondents and spouse/partners, counting the respondents, the spouse/partner, and all children in the calculation of family size;

- an analysis based on total household income reported by respondents, factoring in all adults and children in the calculation of family size.

Normally, only the second analysis would be used in a poverty analysis. However, we decided to use both approaches because of concerns about the limitations of the reported data on household income. One of these limitations is that the respondents may not know the exact incomes of other members of the household, especially in the case of unrelated adults. A second limitation is that household income may be under-reported out of privacy concerns. In fact, about 9 percent of Cohort One and 7 percent of Cohort Two refused to provide any information on household income.

A third limitation of the household income data is that respondents were allowed to report their total household income within broad ranges rather than being asked to give a specific dollar amount. This approach was designed to encourage respondents to report their household income and to avoid having to make complicated calculations in cases where the household had multiple sources of income. The income ranges were those shown above in the section on household income.

1. POVERTY ANALYSIS BASED ON REPORTED EARNINGS

The data in this section provide an analysis of the poverty status of families based on the reported earnings of the respondents and spouses/partners. The analysis is based on the federal poverty guidelines. Family size was calculated by adding the number of children, the respondent, and the spouse/partner if present.²

Poverty Status by Household Type

As shown in Exhibit III-25, almost 38 percent of Cohort One and 34 percent of Cohort Two had earnings that placed them at 130 percent of poverty or higher. The data suggest, therefore, that 62 percent of Cohort One and 66 percent of Cohort Two might meet the gross income test for Food Stamps based solely on the earnings of respondents and their spouses/partners. One-parent families were somewhat more likely than two-parent families to have incomes at 130 percent of poverty or higher.

Overall, the data show that about 44 percent of Cohort One and 48 percent of Cohort Two had incomes below the poverty level. The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples in terms of the percent living below poverty was not statistically significant at the .05 level for either Cohort One or Cohort Two.

² In several of the tables in this section, the n's for the total column are different from the combined n's for the one-parent cases and two-parent cases. This is because of the use of sample weights and a nested sample design. The reason for the different n sizes is explained in further detail in Chapter I, Section F of the report.

**EXHIBIT III-25
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS**

	Cohort One		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	161	166	325**
0 percent	14.8%	14.9%	14.8%
1-49 percent	3.4%	10.8%	5.7%
50-99 percent	24.7%	20.0%	23.3%
Percent below poverty	42.9%*	45.7%*	43.8%
100-129 percent	17.5%	19.1%	18.0%
130 percent or higher	39.6%	35.1%	38.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	132	160	280**
0 percent	21.2%	20.5%	21.0%
1-49 percent	6.1%	5.0%	5.7%
50-99 percent	21.0%	25.3%	22.4%
Percent below poverty	48.3%*	50.8%*	48.4%
100-129 percent	16.6%	18.7%	17.3%
130 percent or higher	35.2%	30.5%	33.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was **not** statistically significant at the .05 level

** Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Poverty Status by Education

As indicated in Exhibit III-26, almost 45 percent of the Cohort One families headed by respondents who had attended college had earnings that placed them at or above 130 percent of poverty. The comparable figure for families headed by high school drop-outs was only 32 percent. The corresponding figures for Cohort Two were 35 percent and 25 percent.

Almost 54 percent of the Cohort One families headed by high school drop-outs had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level, compared to only 35 percent of families headed by a respondent who had attended college. The figures for Cohort Two were 64 percent and 41 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-26
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS,
BY EDUCATION OF THE RESPONDENT**

	Cohort One*		
Percent of Poverty	Did not Complete High School/GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	78	174	73
0 percent	21.1%	15.8%	5.7%
1-49 percent	11.1%	4.4%	3.1%
50-99 percent	22.1%	22.4%	26.5%
Percent below poverty	54.3%**	42.6%	35.3%**
100-129 percent	13.7%	19.1%	20.0%
130 percent or higher	32.0%	38.3%	44.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two*		
Percent of Poverty	Did not Complete High School/GED	Completed High School/GED Only	Attended College
N	73	156	51
0 percent	30.3%	19.1%	13.3%
1-49 percent	9.9%	4.9%	2.0%
50-99 percent	24.3%	20.4%	26.0%
Percent below poverty	64.5%***	44.4%***	41.3%***
100-129 percent	10.4%	18.5%	23.6%
130 percent or higher	25.1%	37.1%	35.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

**The difference between high school drop-outs and college attendees was statistically significant at the .05 level

***The difference between high school drop-outs and all other respondents was statistically significant at the .05 level

Poverty Status by Ethnicity

About 46 percent of the Cohort One families headed by blacks had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level -- the same as for families headed by whites. In Cohort Two, however, whites were somewhat more likely than blacks to be living in poverty. None of the differences was statistically significant.

Poverty Status by Age Group

Exhibit III-27 shows that only 26 percent of Cohort One families headed by a person aged 40 or older had earnings that placed them at or above 130 percent of the poverty level. In contrast, almost 53 percent of families headed by respondents aged 25-29 had earnings at or above 130 percent of poverty.

In Cohort Two, persons aged 18-24 were the most likely to be at 130 percent of poverty or higher. In both samples, the percent of families with earnings below the 100 percent poverty level generally increased with the age of the respondent.

EXHIBIT III-27
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS,
BY AGE OF THE RESPONDENT

	Cohort One*				
Percent of Poverty	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
N	31	60	83	70	79
0 percent	6.6%	4.9%	13.3%	6.3%	34.0%
1-49 percent	8.7%	2.6%	5.6%	8.5%	4.7%
50-99 percent	17.1%	23.3%	29.9%	24.7%	18.2%
Percent below poverty	32.4%	30.8%	48.8%	39.5%	56.9%
100-129 percent	28.0%	15.9%	16.2%	18.3%	17.2%
130 percent or higher	39.6%	53.4%	35.0%	39.1%	25.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two*				
Percent of Poverty	18-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40+
N	54	63	69	44	49
0 percent	22.6%	14.7%	14.9%	27.9%	29.7%
1-49 percent	2.1%	6.4%	3.6%	9.9%	8.0%
50-99 percent	14.4%	24.7%	34.5%	17.2%	12.8%
Percent below poverty	39.1%	45.8%	53.0%	55.0%	50.5%
100-129 percent	10.3%	15.2%	26.6%	14.0%	17.7%
130 percent or higher	50.7%	36.3%	20.5%	31.0%	31.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Poverty Status by Reason for No Longer Receiving Food Stamps

An analysis was conducted of the poverty status of families in terms of the reasons why they were no longer on Food Stamps. For respondents who were still off Food Stamps at the time of the surveys, Exhibit III-28 shows the self-reported reasons given by respondents for no longer getting Food Stamps. Respondents could cite more than one reason.

As indicated, 64 percent of Cohort One and 79 percent of Cohort Two reported that they were off Food Stamps due to their employment or earnings or because of the earnings of a spouse/partner. Respondents from two-parent families were somewhat more likely than respondents from one-parent families to cite employment or earnings as a reason for being off Food Stamps.

About 24 percent of Cohort One and almost 15 percent of Cohort Two reported that they were no longer on Food Stamps because of hassles and related reasons such as pride or dignity, simply not wanting to be on Food Stamps anymore, or missing appointments with caseworkers.

EXHIBIT III-28
SELF-REPORTED REASONS FOR NO LONGER
GETTING FOOD STAMPS
(RESPONDENTS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS)*

	Cohort One		
Reason	One-Parent	Two-Parent	Total
N	166	172	338
Employment or earnings of self or spouse/partner	57.7%	69.4%	63.6%
Too much hassle, pride/dignity, simply didn't want to be on Food Stamps anymore, missed appointments	29.4%	18.9%	24.0%
Change in household composition and other reasons	23.1%	18.1%	20.5%
	Cohort Two		
Reason	One-Parent	Two-Parent	Total
N	132	165	282
Employment or earnings of self or spouse/partner	76.6%	84.5%	79.2%
Too much hassle, pride/dignity, simply didn't want to be on Food Stamps anymore, missed appointments	14.3%	15.4%	14.7%
Change in household composition and other reasons	11.3%	6.1%	9.6%

* Multiple responses possible

Results of the Analysis

Exhibit III-29 shows that 74 percent of Cohort One families who were no longer on Food Stamps due to hassles, requirements, or pride/dignity had earnings that placed them below the 130 percent poverty level. In addition, 54 percent of these families had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. The figures for Cohort Two were 69 percent and 55 percent, respectively.

In contrast, only 50 percent of the Cohort One families who were off Food Stamps due to employment and earnings had incomes that placed them below 130 percent of poverty, and only 32 percent had earnings below the 100 percent poverty level. The figures for Cohort Two were 63 percent and 46 percent.

**EXHIBIT III-29
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON EARNINGS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES/PARTNERS,
BY REASON FOR NO LONGER RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS**

	Cohort One*		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	200	86	71
0 percent	6.2%	20.5%	28.0%
1-49 percent	4.1%	8.1%	6.2%
50-99 percent	22.0%	25.6%	21.2%
Percent below poverty	32.3%	54.2%	55.4%
100-129 percent	18.0%	19.9%	14.1%
130 percent or higher	49.8%	26.0%	30.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two*		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	220	43	26
0 percent	17.9%	27.8%	31.5%
1-49 percent	5.6%	4.1%	8.5%
50-99 percent	22.1%	23.1%	23.1%
Percent below poverty	45.6%	55.0%	63.1%
100-129 percent	17.8%	14.3%	17.3%
130 percent or higher	36.5%	30.7%	19.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Persons who did not provide data on their earnings were excluded from the analysis

Limitations of the Analysis

The major limitation of the analysis presented above is that it does not factor in non-wage income received by respondents, such as child support and SSI. Specific data were not gathered on the amounts of child support, SSI, or other income received by respondents. Also, as noted, other household members besides the respondents and their spouses/partners are not considered in terms of income or family size.

For families still off Food Stamps, Chapter VI of this report shows that, among Cohort One, about 39 percent of the respondents in one-parent cases and 14 percent of the respondents in two-parent cases were receiving child support payments. The figures for Cohort Two were 33 percent and 16 percent, respectively. However, we do not know how much was being paid and whether the payments were received every month.

For Cohort One, Chapter VI of the report also shows that 9 percent of the one-parent households and 8 percent of the two-parent households were receiving SSI benefits. For

Cohort Two, the percentages were 14 percent and 10 percent. Again, the exact amounts of these benefits were not determined in the surveys.

Conclusions from the Analysis

Because of the above limitations, the analyses presented in this section provide only an exploratory estimate of the percentage of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers who might still meet the income criteria for Food Stamps. Another factor to consider is the assets of household members. Data from the surveys (see Chapter VI) show that at least 56 percent of the one-parent families in Cohort One owned a vehicle, and that at least 79 percent of two-parent households owned a vehicle. The figures for Cohort Two were 65 percent and 79 percent. The value of these vehicles is unknown.

Overall, the analysis suggests that certain sub-groups of non-TANF Food Stamp leavers may be particularly at risk of not receiving Food Stamp benefits even though still eligible. These groups include persons who have not completed high school and persons aged 30 and older. In addition, families who are staying off Food Stamps due to hassles and related factors appear much more likely than families staying off due to employment to be eligible for benefits.

2. POVERTY ANALYSIS BASED ON TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Approach to the Analysis

The data in this section provide an analysis of the poverty status of families based on total household income reported by respondents. Household size was calculated by adding the number of children, the respondent, their spouse/partner if present, and all other unrelated adults living in the household. Respondents were asked to report their monthly household income based on the following categories: \$0, \$1-499, \$500-999, \$1,000-1,499, \$1,500-1,999, and \$2,000 or higher. To conduct the poverty analysis, the mid-points of the ranges were used, as follows: \$0, \$250, \$750, \$1,250, and \$1,750. Respondents who reported household income of \$2,000 or higher were assigned an income of \$2,250.

In Cohort One, about 11 percent of the respondents from one-parent families and 5 percent of the respondents from two-parent families refused to provide information or said that they did not know the incomes of other household members. For Cohort Two, the percentages were 7 percent and 8 percent, respectively. These cases were taken out of the analysis, and the percentages for other respondents were adjusted proportionally.

Results by Household Type

Exhibit III-30 presents the results of the analysis. The data show that 55 percent of Cohort One and 62 percent of Cohort Two had household income that placed them below 130 percent of the poverty level. These families would appear to be eligible for Food Stamps based on reported household income, without considering assets. About 35 percent of Cohort

One and 41 percent of Cohort Two were below the poverty level. The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples in terms of the percent living below the poverty level was not statistically significant for either Cohort One or Cohort Two.

**EXHIBIT III-30
POVERTY STATUS OF HOUSEHOLDS STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS,
BASED ON TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

	Cohort One		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	165	173	335
0 percent	1.4%	2.4%	1.7%
1-49 percent	8.5%	6.1%	7.7%
50-99 percent	28.3%	20.7%	25.8%
Percent below poverty	38.2%*	29.2%*	35.2%
100-129 percent	20.1%	18.9%	19.7%
130 percent or higher	41.7%	51.8%	45.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Percent of Poverty	1-parent	2-parent	Total
N	135	154	281
0 percent	6.5%	3.9%	5.6%
1-49 percent	7.3%	6.5%	7.0%
50-99 percent	28.2%	27.9%	28.1%
Percent below poverty	42.0%*	38.3%*	40.7%
100-129 percent	20.1%	23.5%	21.2%
130 percent or higher	38.0%	38.2%	38.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*The difference between the 1-parent and 2-parent samples was not statistically significant at the .05 level

Results by Reason for No Longer Being on Food Stamps

For Cohort One, Exhibit III-31 shows that 67 percent of the families who were off Food Stamps because of hassles and related factors had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty. In addition, almost 49 percent of these families were below 100 percent of poverty. The figures for Cohort Two were 67 percent and 48 percent, respectively.

In contrast, only 42 percent of the Cohort One families who were off Food Stamps because of employment had household incomes below 130 percent of poverty, and only 21 percent were below 100 percent of poverty. The figures for Cohort Two were 58 percent and 37 percent, respectively.

**EXHIBIT III-31
POVERTY STATUS OF FAMILIES STILL OFF FOOD STAMPS, BASED
ON TOTAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME -- BY REASON FOR NO LONGER
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS**

	Cohort One		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	186	86	64
0 percent	0.7%	2.1%	3.5%
1-49 percent	3.0%	11.4%	12.9%
50-99 percent	17.8%	35.2%	33.9%
Percent below poverty	21.5%	48.7%	50.3%
100-129 percent	21.0%	18.7%	13.4%
130 percent or higher	57.6%	32.6%	36.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Cohort Two		
Percent of Poverty	Employment and Earnings	Hassles, Requirements, Pride/Dignity	Other Reasons
N	223	40	25
0 percent	4.7%	8.0%	8.5%
1-49 percent	7.2%	7.2%	3.0%
50-99 percent	24.8%	32.0%	49.8%
Percent below poverty	36.7%	47.2%	61.3%
100-129 percent	21.7%	20.1%	15.8%
130 percent or higher	41.7%	32.7%	22.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%